N° 8

REMARKS ON A PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED

The Principles of the REVOLUTION *vindicated:*

THE WORK OF

R. WATSON, D.D.F.R.S.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN CAMBRIDGE.

BY AN UNDERGRADUATE.

CAMBRIDGE,

Printed by J. ARCHDEACON Printer to the UNIVERSITY;

Sold by J. NICHOLSON, in Cambridge; J. RIVINGTON, St. Paul's Church-yard, S. CROWDER, in Pater-noſter Row, London; and J. FLETCHER, in Oxford.

M.DCC.LXXVI.

If there be any more eligible Patronage for the following Divertiſement, its Author will freely give up his own Choice of that of CANDOR.

Angues SENECTUTEM *exuunt, eamque protinus* DEVORANT.
Plin. lib. 8.

CONTROVERSIES in general have ſeldom ſuch good effects in Theory or Practice, as will repay the expence of time made in their ſupport. — Prudent men have therefore both avoided, and diſcouraged them, as Obſtacles to real advancement in Science and Morals.—This their mode of Action too receives an additional degree of ſanction from a vulgar truth, viz. That diſputes reſpect rather * the mode of lation, than any actual difference of ſentiment. — Or (upon the Profeſſor's Principles) that only — ſince mankind are born with the *ſame natural* advantages, perceive with the *ſame* eyes, and determine with the *ſame* judgment, all difference of opinion muſt be *only* a difference of language. — This therefore mine Eſſay muſt be the effect of ſome imprudent paſſion, and yet not culpable; for while I confeſs myſelf laid open to the world, I confeſs at the ſame time, no perſonal malevolence (however "apt men are to do injuries,") or mean opinion of the diſcernment of the Age, induced me to offer theſe few Remarks to its attention. I publiſh them, becauſe I humbly "conceive them founded in truth." — I propoſe not to give the Reader violent emotions; but to offer to him ſatisfaction, as a dubious character. — If a favourer of the Author, that no perſons of abilities will hereafter engage in the diſpute, and degrade themſelves by becoming fellow-

* Omnem eſſe contentionem inter homines doctos in verbi controverſiâ poſitam.
Cic. de Orat.

fellow-labourers with me. — If an enemy to his Principles, that *any* one has dared to oppoſe the propagation of ſuch *Doctrine*.

II. Our *Regius Profeſſor*, being obliged by the duty of his Office to read a Sermon at certain ſeaſons, or (in the language of a worthy predeceſſor) *to take the place of a Watchman for an hour in the tower of the Univerſity*, thinks it equally incumbent upon him, I imagine, to bring diſcourſes ſuited to the Day. — The concourſe of People upon this occaſion and effect of his doctrine, anſwered his utmoſt expectations; the one his Vanity, the other his Deſign: for I muſt own him incapable of acting without deliberation, and of too great learning and experience in life not to foreſee its conſequences. — Duty indeed led him to the Temple; but led him not through the paths of dirty politics. His Guide now was ſome more ſelfiſh principle and precedents warily miſconſtrued. — To ſuch motives however we owe the preſent Diſcourſe.

III. The Reader's imagination will, I dare ſay, anticipate the conſequences. — His Sermon became the common Topic of converſation, and various are men's judgments of it, according to their various inclinations and capacities. — Some extoll it, as a fine Compoſition, replete with erudition and truth. — Others cenſure it, as improperly introduced, as falſe, or both.—They ſay the ſubject has been exhauſted, by *Hobbes*, *Locke*, and others, and could have *now* no other tendency than to inflame the minds of the unwary, and to convince the world, that the Author had ſpirit ſufficient to aſſert his Patron's cauſe, at the expence of his own good ſenſe and integrity. — However, amidſt their various opinions, I muſt confeſs, I never found one, which was grounded upon a "MISREPRESENTATION," a wrong quotation, or Interpretation of the Author's words; if the Sermon as ſpoken and printed be the ſame. — And to uſe the term MISREPRESENTATION in any other ſenſe would be to ſpeak unintelligibly, or to affirm what few can be ignorant of, viz. that ſome perſon's ſentiments were different from his own. — Indeed (to uſe the language of the hiſtorian, as applied on

Dr.

Dr. *Sandy* on a ſimilar occaſion) *ſo wiſely and warily he handled the words, that his enemies got not ſo full advantage againſt him, as they expected.* — This *little advantage* however was ſufficient for his purpoſe. — He could now expreſs his ſurpriſe, that his principles had "expoſed him to ſome LITTLE miſrepreſentation EVEN in this place." — But why ſuch ſurprize? — 'Tis true the efforts of ſome men of *foreign growth* have been long cooperating with the influence of Mathematics to introduce a Licentiouſneſs of thought. — But is it really and univerſally eſtabliſhed? — Did not the Majority of voices in the Senate upon ſome late occaſions evince the contrary? — This is therefore an unjuſt repreſentation of the complexion of our Univerſity. — Nor is the compariſon implied in the expreſſion leſs ſo. — For of all other ſeats of Literature, aſſume Oxford, which by common report has ever abounded in men of paſſive obedience; and that you may judge how general and continuous the Opinion has been of our adherence to theſe his principles, I will tranſcribe a paſſage from the hiſtorian before quoted.—"OXFORD men tell us how they would not ſurrender a convict of high treaſon, but ſtood upon their immunities. — But CAMBRIDGE is ſenſible of no privileges inconſiſtent with Allegiance, accounting Loyalty to her Sovereign the greateſt Liberty." — This little miſrepreſentation however, he urges as a plea for his publication. — When men the moſt ſtupid are determined to act, they ſeldom want invention to frame pretences. — And the Doctor muſt have been very lazy, or have entertained a mean idea of the diſcernment of the age, in that he framed no better excuſe for publication; — but that it was the effect of deſign, is too evident. — It was written for the pulpit with the ſame *accuracy*, as it came from the preſs. — He confeſſes he thought it high time to declare *publicly* to his Patron, how much he is his Obliged Servant; and what *preſent* could be more acceptable to *oppoſition?* *

VI. We

* As ſoon as the Diſcourſe was printed, Copies were ſent to the *Duke* of *G——n*, *M——ſs* of *R——m*, *L——ds G——y*, *C——h*; *B——p* of *P——h*, Dr. *P——y*, and others.

IV. We have thus far purſued the motives of our Author for preaching, and publiſhing.—We have ſeen the effects of the SERMON. — A careful peruſal of the PAMPHLET will enable us to divine ſomething alſo of its effects in the world, ſince he has now *publicly avowed his principles.* He ſtiles it "*the Principles of the* REVOLUTION *vindicated.*" — If theſe were the Principles of the Revolution, they muſt have been received by the effectors of it. — The effectors muſt have been men of ſpeculation. — They muſt have acted in conſequence of ſpeculation. — For to aſſert, that men, who act in a certain manner, act from the ſame general principles, which would beſtir the ſpeculative man to act in the ſame manner, is to aſſert all theſe things.—But is it not contrary to common experience, that men act always from ſpeculative principles? — Is it not evident, that they often act from the influence of ſome darling paſſion? However, I wave any further diſquiſition of this ſort, which would lead me from the main Deſign, his *method* of vindicating the principles which *he* ſays were the principles of the Revolution.

V. His Diſcourſe may be divided into four general Propoſitions, and three Catalogues, one of *Poſſibilities*, another of *Interrogations*, and the third of *Suppoſitions.*

1. That the nature of civil ſocieties, and expediency of forming them is very juſtly derived from the *natural equality* of mankind, their *aptneſs* and *abilities* to do an Injury to every other with whom they have *any* intercourſe.

2. That theſe principles are the ſureſt foundation of juſt reaſoning about the duties of mankind in their individual and collective capacity, and the concluſions drawn from them not repugnant to the particular Revelations of God's will.

3. That many important truths of this ſort were not generally underſtood, or generally received amongſt us, till after the Revolution.

4. That

4. That the preſent Diſturbances are ſimilar in their Origin to thoſe which overſpread the land in *Charles* the Firſt's reign, and they may not have ſo favourable an iſſue.

5. A Catalogue of *Poſſibilities*, by which we may become the moſt abject ſlaves in *Europe*, terminated with a conviction, that we ſhall not then degenerate from the blood of our Anceſtors, but overturn the Conſtitution.

6. The ſecond of *Interrogations*, in which are contained the chief cauſes of *Charles*'s deſtruction, obliquely applied to the preſent Reign.

7. The third of *Hypotheſes*, the Conſequences of which he thinks would be the union of the legiſlative and executive Authority, a Tyranny of King and People.

After this view of the Author's Deſign, I may be indulged (I hope, without any inconvenience to my reader) the liberty of taking his propoſitions, as they moſt naturally occur to me.

VI. It is ſaid that the good *Dr. *Sandy*'s text, upon an occaſion of this ſort, was the effect of Piety and Chance. — That he prayed, till his Bible opened; and took the firſt verſe his eyes fixed upon. — But far be it from me to ſuppoſe our Author capable of ſo much *ſlavery* in prayer, or *ſuperſtition* in action. — For though his enemies may ſay that it is improper, and the TRUTH of *no* part of the diſcourſe depends upon it; yet there appears to me a degree of dexterity and choice in it. — Is it not taken from the very fountain of Non-reſiſtance? — Who therefore will believe in the reality of a Mineral, when a ſtream of

* *J. Dudley*, duke of *Northumberland*, came to *Cambridge* with his army and commiſſion to apprehend the *Lady Mary*. — At night he ſent for Dr. *Sandy* to preach before him the next day.—The Dr. late at night betook himſelf to his prayers and ſtudy, deſiring God to direct him to a fixt text for that time. — His Bible opens at the firſt chapter of Joſhua, and (though he heard no voice, with St. Aug. tolle & lege) a ſtrong fancy inclined him to fix on the firſt words he beheld: Verſe 16. *And they anſwered Joſhua, ſaying, All that thou commandeſt us we will do, and whitherſoever thou ſendeſt us we will go.* — And a FIXT text indeed for him; to whom it occaſioned much ſanctified affliction. *Fuller.*

of ſuch *pure* water flows from its ſuppoſed ſource? — Be it therefore the effect of choice; and I will even dare to ſay not of JUDGMENT. — "He that will read the Epiſtles as he ought, muſt obſerve what it is in them is principally aimed at, find what is the Argument in hand, and how managed; he muſt look into the Drift of the Diſcourſe, obſerve the coherence and connexion of the parts, and ſee how it is conſiſtent with itſelf, and other parts of Scripture." *Locke*, Reaſ. of Chriſt. Rel. The reader will upon a very ſlight peruſal of this Epiſtle, ſee the writer's drift, and with no leſs eaſe determine, how far one confined interpretation will juſtify another equally ſo. — The * hiſtorian adds, that Dr. *Sandy*'s text occaſioned him much affliction.

VII. "Mankind *may* be conſidered, &c."

This Sentence cannot be controverted as a *mere poſſibility*. — Beings of properties different from the general properties of Man, may examine him, and whatever they may have had experience of, in *any* view, or in a manner we have no conception of. — Beings alſo, which have the common properties of man, may examine him, and whatever they have had experience of, under one general view, as partaking of one common nature, whether *real* or *chimerical*; and deduce alſo from ſuch an aſſociation conſequences ſine limite. Nor would there be any thing eſſential wanting to theſe *ſpeculative* truths, but a clear perception of the relation of the ſuppoſed Qualities. — But whoever attempts ſuch a plan, will be ſoon led to Doctrines repugnant to the conſtitution of things, and ſhocking to human nature. — He may perhaps expect applauſe for the vivacity of his invention, but, more juſtly a weight of cenſure for his imprudence. — Knowledge of this ſort is uſeful, as it correſponds with external objects, and dangerous as it abhors from them.

The ſpecies being diſtinguiſhed by their nominal Eſſences †, and the Idea,

* How afterwards this Dr. was ſpoiled of his Goods, ſent up Priſoner to London, how with Difficulty he was enlarged, and with great difficulty eſcaped beyond the Seas, is related by Maſter Fox. Ibid.

† Homo autem eſt, quod rationis eſt particeps, per quam conſequentia cernit, cauſas rerum vidit. CIC. de Off. See Burlam.

Idea, annexed to the term Man, being that of an exiſtence, compoſed of an organized Body, and rational part or Soul; if Beings, correſponding in this ſpecial nature, have not the qualities of the Soul and Body *equal*, and the *ſame* in number and perfection, they cannot be termed *equal*. — * They cannot expect the ſame degrees of pleaſure and pain from the ſame objects. — The one may effect what the other cannot. — The one may yield to the influence of an oppreſſion, which would give the other no perceptible emotions. — Beſides theſe powers being in a continual flux, and a man in an *advanced age* differing from himſelf when a *child*, as much or perhaps more than two animals of *different* ſpecies, at *certain* periods of their exiſtence: It may be aſked, at what part of their duration do they put on this equality? — It will be anſwered, I ſuppoſe, by *equal* we mean partaking of the *ſame* common nature. — That the ſpecial Idea exiſts in every Individual of the ſpecies, needs no great *conjuration* to find out. — It entitles every Individual to the *ſpecial* advantages of its claſs, but not to the *numeric*. — And as the common nature gives a capacity of ſociety, ſo the individual nature gives to each a different capacity. — *Every ſtar differeth from another ſtar in glory*. — Nor can they be called *equal*, who are *numerically different*, with any greater propriety, than thoſe which are *ſpecifically*; and thus *all* animals or *no* animals are *equal*. — But in ſupport of this levelling Doctrine, it is urged as a great Bleſſing of our Being, as an Inſtance of the impartiality of God's diſtributions. — The latter Argument will bring on a fine piece of Doctrine: — Partiality is inconſiſtent with Juſtice: a difference of diſtributions is partiality. — There is a partiality therefore in every work of Creation, and the ſupreme Diſpoſer of all things *has* acted, and now daily *does* act inconſiſtent with the attribute of Juſtice. — But they, who

* Si ſola Corpora Hominum et Brutorum ſpectamus, non majus eſt inter Homines et Bruta diſcrimen, quam inter varias Brutorum ſpecies inter ſe collatas. Imò verò Bruta ſunt homini copore quam cæteris Brutis ſimiliora; ut enim rectè Poeta vetus, Simia quam ſimilis turpiſſima Beſtia nobis! — Verum actiones Hominum et Brutorum oſtendunt, animi *ratione* eſſe inter nos et ea Diſcrimen. *Cleric.*

Neque ulla poteſt adferri ratio, quâ conſtet non eſſe varios naturarum SENTIENTIUM ordines, quibus aliis alii ſunt perfectiores, ſeu pluribus gaudeant proprietatibus. Ibid.

who with *Hobbes* allow a Corporeal Deity, or with *Spinoza* hold the Univerſe to be God, will find no difficulties in theſe things. — The former is ſo far from being received, that many think the Idea of it dangerous to our exiſtence. — And certainly to call *any* of the Deity's diſtributions a *Bleſſing* or *Vengeance* is to paſs an impious Judgment upon them. — " We are all ſprung, he adds, from the ſame ſtock." — This is mere aſſertion; and if the Opinion of *Preadamites* did not affect it, ſtill it has no tendency to prove our Equality. — No more than to ſhew that the ſea is the ſource of fountains would be a proof of the ſimilarity of their waters.

The natural advantages urged by our Author are common to Every ſpecies of animals. — The Earth really ſupplies all with their conveniences of life. — Yet he will hardly ſay the mode of enjoyment is the *ſame*, and that there is no Difference in the Species: How then from hence no Difference in the Individuals? — Experience too convinces us, that men differ in their Mental and Corporeal Faculties. — Thus ſome have been remarkable for Invention — Others for Judgment — Others for Memory.* — The paſſions put on a variety of appearances, nor are they mixed in the ſame proportion in two conſtitutions. — And while ſome uſe the ſame organs with various degrees of ſenſibility, others are ſaid to acquire the ſame ideas by the aſſiſtance of different organs.†—One would think, ſays the Spectator, that the life of a philoſopher, and man were of different dates ‡; for we find that the generality of theſe wiſe men were nearer a hundred than ſixty years at their reſpective deaths. — In ſhort: Can all undergo the *ſame* labour? ‖ — Will

* *Porcius* could remember all the Declamations he had ever ſpoken without miſſing a word.

Gneas, ambaſſador to the Romans from Pyrrhus, learned in one Day the names of his ſpectators. Sen. lib. 1. Plin. l. 1. 24.

† *Peter Durand*, when about five years old, loſt his tongue by a gangrene, and could ſpeak perfectly afterwards. German Ephem.

Quidam fuit, qui venit ad duc. Ætruriæ aulam qui colores per tactum cognoſebat. *Grimald.* de Luc. et Color.

‡ *Lewis Cornaro* lived intemperately till forty, but afterwards by temperance prolonged his life to his hundredth year. Rules for Health.

‖ *S. Chilton* of *Tinſbury*, in the years 1693, 1696, 1697, ſlept divers weeks together with inconſiderable decay. *Derh.*

Will the *ſame* food appeaſe every appetite? — the *ſame* cloathing ſuit all climates, and ages; the *ſame* climate agree with all conſtitutions?— Can *all* eyes bear the *ſame* quantity of light; *all* bodies the *ſame* degree of heat? — Are not conſtitutions groſſer, and perception leſs vivid the farther we depart from the line? — But at laſt our Author ſolves this Phænomenon. — Some diſparity, he ſays, may be obſerved; yet this difference becomes leſs and leſs as we increaſe the numbers compared together; ceaſing entirely, when we take in the whole. — Or in other words, the ſpecific Idea exiſts in every Individual. — A noble Diſcovery! — He never gave Lectures in Logic; therefore we muſt attribute it to his own Invention, and pardon the *formality* of PROOF. — Mankind are therefore equal, or in other words, every Individual has the ſpecific Idea; nor are they *leſs* Independent: For who will deny that man is free? — and our Author has very handſomely confounded the ideas of Independency and Liberty: or, if he ſays he has not, then he has aſſerted a falſe propoſition. — * For the exiſtence of man is inſeparable from Figure and Site, and indifferent to any, therefore dependent.

Our Author notwithſtanding would wiſh to mean by Equality and Independency, ſomething, it ſeems, more than what we have allowed; and wants to ſtrengthen his *argumentation* by analogy. — But more he cannot prove of *our* ſpecies.—How then will he prove it of the ſpecies, whoſe powers he muſt have *leſs* or perhaps *no* knowledge of? — This is ſomewhat like leading a man from obſcurity to perfect darkneſs, that he may (upon his return) miſtake the ſame obſcurity for Day Light. — His general concluſion muſt therefore appear faulty. — He ſays, "his experience has been very extenſive; that there are numberleſs ranks of beings, which obſerve theſe laws of Inferiority and Equality." — That proof of Equality has been examined. — The *ſubjection* of claſſes at the expence of their exiſtence is contrary to experience, and the general notion of inſtinct.—Calling one claſs *inferior* or *ſuperior* is relative. — Thus Man is ſuperior to the Lion in courage, inferior

* Concludunt igitur Metaphyſici eam omnem naturam eſſe *dependentem*, cui neceſſarius eſt omninò modus aliquis ex certo modorum genere, ſi modo omnium modorum iſtius generis pariter ſit capax. Corpus igitur res eſt dependens et effecta. Synop. Met.

rior in ferocity. — So that as Equality and Independence imply not Liberty, neither do Inferiority and Inequality, Subjection.

VIII. " Whom various cauſes, &c." That this propoſition may be true, it is requiſite that mankind be conceived as united into one heap, into one place.—For to look upon a number of bodies placed on a certain ſurface, as one aggregate diffuſed *over* it, and then talk of a *further diſperſion* is incoherent. — For however this *one* aggregate may have its parts ſeparated, they cannot take up more ſpace when at ſome determined diſtances than at different. — The limitation of this aggregate in time is as ſuſpicious as its limitation in number is dubious. — There is the ſame teſtimony before, as for ſome years after the Deluge, if our Author credit *Moſes*. — And ſuppoſing, that the increaſe of our ſpecies would diminiſh the race of other noxious animals; that the induſtry of individuals would leave no ſpot uncultivated to the limit of its perfection, and the moſt beneficial mode of agriculture adopted; yet would there be immenſe tracts, where the ſoil would yield no produce; others, where the extremes of heat and cold would render agriculture unſupportable, and the ſituation impoſſible. And yet notwithſtanding all this, a country, which is now at a mean in cultivation, and number of inhabitants, muſt after this triple increaſe be *αυταρκης*.

IX. " Has been chiefly owing to the ravages of war, &c." The mutual exertion of one man's powers againſt another's, is termed a *combat*, of the powers of multitudes a *tumult*. — This *tumult* puts on the nature of *war*, when made in conſequence of the determination of the multitude, or directors of that multitude, and carried on according to their eſtabliſhed modes. — There can be no war prior to ſociety. — It cannot therefore affect a ſtate of *nature*; a ſtate of natural equality or inequality, or the principles of it. — Neither can war be called the *chief* cauſe of this dearth of inhabitants. Under the forms of feudal Government, when each clan's impetuous ſally muſt be deemed a war; when men encamped before a *city*, fought againſt

it,

it, and took it, and put the inhabitants to the ſword, this might *probably* have been the chief cauſe of the premature death of the ſpecies. — But now, though our inſtruments of deſtruction have become more dreadful, their effects are leſs fatal. — Beſides, the number of offſpring depends upon the fruitfulneſs of the females, ſtrength of the males, and number of both. — *War* at this time diminiſhes the number of men. — The loſs is leſs than the number employed. — Moſt of theſe have gotten children; and though they had not, *we* at leaſt may have a force much larger than ever we had,* and there remain men equal in number to our women. — So that war now diminiſhes only the number of men: and what ratio has this decrement to that which ariſes from inſtitutions and caſualties? — What are the effects of religious orders from *Japan* to the remoteſt corner of the weſtern world? — Who has ſtopped the gloomy horrors of the Plague, and reſtored the ſhattered frame of Conſumption, Famine, and Diſeaſe? — Who hath controuled the violence of Thunder, and ſtretched his arm againſt the fury of the Elements? — War being thus improperly introduced, is as improperly divided into ſpecies; the one, " which nobly aſſerts the rights of nature, againſt the abuſes of civil authority;" the other, " which ſupports, the reproach to human nature, † Deſpotiſm." — The method of expreſſing this *temporizing* diſtinction cannot ſurely eſcape the Reader's notice. — The motives and differences of war alſo are ſo numerous, and obvious, that it will be unneceſſary to obſerve — *this is a partial diſtribution.*

X. " Every individual of our ſpecies, &c." That every individual of our ſpecies ſhould have an *aptneſs* of injuring *every* other, with whom he has *any* intercourſe, is an aſſertion as degrading to human nature, as it is erroneous. — Where is Benevolence, Generoſity, and that very

* According to major *Graunt*, the number of males is to that of females, as 14 to 13. Allow one for every 14 males, and the aſſertion will be evident.

† Deſpotiſm extinguiſhes or overrules the ſuggeſtions of common ſenſe; kills the very ſeeds of virtue, and perverts the moſt ſacred and important offices into the means and inſtruments of vice. *Hurd*, note 176. Ars Poet.

very Gratitude, which our Author has teſtified with ſo much pomp? — * The Orientals believed there were good and evil parts of the ſoul, or good and evil dæmons. — This perſuaſion paſſed to the Hebrews and Greeks. — The Platonics and Pythagoreans, ſtrenuous for the dignity of human nature, were willing to admit the good only. — The Epicureans on the contrary, and their *followers*, acknowledged the Dominion of the bad. — And if this be the *uſe* of learning the Eaſtern languages, to learn that we are a compound more poiſonous than reaſon and experience can ſuggeſt; I ſhould be as unwilling to be a proſelyte to our Author's † opinion of their utility, as to his doctrine derived from them. — Opinions to the contrary are ‡ numerous. — Let one inſtance ſuffice. — The Contriver of human nature hath wiſely furniſhed man with two principles of action, Self-love and Benevolence; deſigned one of them to make man wakeful to his own intereſt, the other to diſpoſe him for giving his utmoſt aſſiſtance to all engaged in the ſame purſuit. ‖ — If men had this *aptneſs* in a ſtate of nature, they would have it in a ſtate of civil ſociety. — For § Education could not extinguiſh it. — I confeſs, I do not experience this tendency to injure *any*, much leſs *every* one with whom I converſe. — If the Doctor found the prevalency of it in his *own* frame ſo great, that he could not conceal it, he ſhould at leaſt have ſpoken diffidently of it in *other* men's. — Our Author may join in the method of deriving the neceſſity of civil ſociety

* Thus *Panthea* in *Xenophon*. — It is certain we have two ſouls: when the good ſoul rules, I undertake noble and virtuous actions; but when the bad ſoul predominates, I am forced to do evil. This opinion originated from that part of Babylonia, the inhabitants of which were called בשרם.

Η φυσις πειθει εἶναι τὺς δαίμονας ἀγνὺς
Καὶ τὰ κακῆς ὕλης ἐλαττήματα χρηστὰ δὲ ἐσθλὰ. Orac.

See *Stanl.* Liv. *Pſillus* de Dæm.

† Laſt Commencement, our Profeſſor recommended, in the Theatre, the ſtudy of the Oriental Languages.

‡ Synop. Metaphy. —— *Clericus*. —— *Burlamaq*. Nat. Law. —— *Plouquet*. Met.

‖ Spectator.

§ The regulation not the extinction of our connate propenſities is the effect of education and philoſophy. Dr. *Tiſſot*. § 8.

ſociety from this miſanthropic paſſion; but the very notion of a ſtatus naturæ, and the real *univerſal* exiſtence of this paſſion, are poſtulates, which few judicious men *will* allow, and no good men *wiſh* to allow. — Without any reſpect to the *gradual* increaſe of mankind, * and diſtinction of individuals in ſociety, conceive with our Author an aggregate of Beings *equal* in all circumſtances and relations; and reflect whether any uneaſineſs at one perſon's poſſeſſions could induce another to injure him, and deprive him of what he enjoyed himſelf. — That the poſſeſſion of a thing can ſuffer an uneaſineſs to be formed at the proſpect of another's enjoying the ſame, ſeems as chimerical as the ſtate formed in conſequence of it. — And I flatter myſelf, that thoſe, who are not convinced of this malignity by ſome other means, will hardly admit it upon our Doctor's recommendation.

XI. His idea of the general inferiority of claſſes, and equality of individuals in the ſame claſs, may now be compared with the ſecond declaration of God's will. — This Benediction implies indeed, that the Deity willed, that Noah and his ſons ſhould be the ſpeedy reſtorers of their race, and that all hindrances from other claſſes, and the individuals in their own claſs ſhould be aboliſhed. — But not that he willed alſo, they ſhould have an equal ſhare in this work, nor equal advantages *natural* and *perſonal*. — And though men's powers were to be ſuch, that they could make other animals become as the green herb they trod on; yet does this Charter not extend through the claſſes of animals. — This paſſage therefore, as it does not invalidate, ſo does it not in any degree confirm the Author's Laws of Nature. — And might not one ſay it is ſuperfluous to reveal what the light of nature can find out? — So that though there really be nothing in the Scriptures ſubverſive of theſe concluſions, we cannot thence conclude them true.

XII. Though

* See *Miller* on the Diſtinct. of Ranks in Society.

† Of theſe Manichean Principles, ſee *King*, Orig. Evil. *Plouquet*. Met. De Orgine et permiſſione mali.

XII. Though our Author has been ſo unhappy in his notions of the Equality, Independence, and Malignity of Mankind; yet is he not equally ſo in thoſe of their duties conſidered in their collective capacity. — That every form of Government originates in the choice of the members of a ſociety, is as great a truth, as that the ſociety itſelf originates in other cauſes, than the malignity of individuals.— It is equally true — that the community has the ſame right to reſume, that it had to confer its Government upon one man or any order of men; — *that for any law to be obligatory to a community, it is requiſite the free conſent of it be obtained to the enacting of that law; — that if one man or order of men to whom the *Majeſty* is entruſted, promiſe to act according to any fixed rules, they are bound to the community, however it vary by acceſſion or ſucceſſion of individuals; — that the right of *Majeſty* to alter or aboliſh the laws of the conſtitution depends upon its original form; — that Individuals are *free* to quit the ſociety, but bound to it in conſcience, in proportion to the protection they received from it, during their minority; — that the prerogative of Majeſty may be unconditional. — ‡ The Profeſſor very juſtly concludes about the prevalency of truths, the oppoſite to his; and the miſeries of that Family to which the ſafety of our nation is indebted.

But alas! party deforms the beauty of his compoſition; on raven wing, he ſoars amidſt the fury of the elements.

XIII. His Poſſibilities, Interrogations, and Hypotheſes, however judiciouſly ſelected, and forcibly expreſſed, will be an eternal ſtigma on his prudence: as his attempt, to vindicate the preſent unnatural Rebellion, to impreſs his hearers with the moſt dreadful and alarming ideas of its conſequences, and to make the pulpit a ſtew for Civil Diſcord, will upon

* Demoſtheni Lex eſt πολεως συνθηκη κοινη.— Ipſæ Leges nullâ aliâ ex causâ nos tenent, quam quod judicio populi receptæ ſunt. *Julian.* l. 31.

‡ Dico primo, præſidendi in Repub. poteſtatem, quoque tandem modo ad eam perveniatur, ab ipſo Deo eſſe, ſolo et immediate, nullatenus a populo. Per me reges regnant. Prov. 8. *Sanders.* De Juram. Oblig.

See *Gordon*'s Tacitus, Diſc. IV. § 1, 2, 5, 6.

upon his Principles. — His Diſcourſe at firſt ſeemed moderate, its direction dubious; but ſoon was it ſwollen with the breath of diſaffection, and its violence added to the torrent of oppoſition. — It will give rapidity to Rebellion, and its effects ceaſe with the fate of empires.

XIV. We might wiſh indeed that Diſturbances in a ſyſtem could be quelled by the original force, without the Deſtruction of a part; and that the memory of our misfortunes ceaſed in the termination of our pain. — But cauſtic cures leave too deep traces of their Application, and to ſtop irregularities in a ſyſtem, muſt be to counterpoiſe, or annihilate the force, which gives them Birth. — The former *foreign* and *impoſſible*; the latter *domeſtic* and *eaſy*. This therefore is the method by which as perfect regularity may be reſtored to our conſtitution, as in any period was eſtabliſhed amongſt us.—And the following reflections will not ſuffer us to entertain a doubt of the poſſibility at leaſt of its ſpeedy application.

It is poſſible, that the Principles of our Author, ſo generally unfaſhionable, may have actuated ſo ſmall a part of the Electors of our repreſentation, that they have elevated to that office men of ſober ſentiments, fitted for every ſpecies of deliberation and action, but thoſe of Malevolence to their Country, and peeviſh oppoſition to its motions: — it is poſſible, that the majority of ſuch a repreſentation may have perſeverance to diſcharge their fiduciary truſt with honour to themſelves, and ſatisfaction to their conſtituents: — it is poſſible, that a reciprocation of kind offices may ſubſiſt between a good miniſter and this upright majority, that he may reward them with the approbation of a juſt Sovereign, they return the public applauſe with public ſupplies, and mutually aſſiſt in the preſervation of the ſubject: — it is poſſible, that the influence of adminiſtration may by theſe means ſo far expand, as to lay a due biaſs on the minds of the refractory few in both houſes of repreſentation; — that they may at length be made ſenſible of the increaſe of private property and public credit; — that ſhame may induce ſome, gratitude others, if not to ſupport, at leaſt to acquieſce in meaſures, which they cannot diſapprove, and an intereſted

tereſted expectation operate, where reaſon and argument had no effect: — it is poſſible, that under theſe circumſtances, the ſtrength of the conſtitution may be rapidly confirmed, and the fabric of modern licentiouſneſs and oppoſition finally ſubverted; — that the Bulk of the people will be convinced of the real ſources of their misfortunes, rouſe from their Lethargy, before a general oblivion be caſt over their ſouls, bid their public Ædifices ceaſe to ring with the impious horrors of diſaffection, and emulous of the virtues of their Anceſtors, with united efforts drag to condign puniſhment the moſt peſtilent of all Traytors, the *pious* Traytors of the conſtitution.

The Author's cautious method of writing will juſtify the Queriſt.

Quer. 1. Whether *Hobbes* or the *Apoſtle* could have afforded a paſſage, the better ſuited to this diſcourſe?

Quer. 2. Whether Dr. *Sandy's* text be a juſt repreſentation of our PROFESSOR's principles?

Quer. 3. Whether his ignorance of Liberty will be a ſufficient plea for confounding it with Independency?

Quer. 4. Whether his *proofs*, that the ſpecific Idea exiſts in every Individual, be not tedious and ſuperfluous: and has he proved any more?

Quer. 5. Whether the mutual univerſal malignity of our ſpecies be not a doctrine both ſhocking and erroneous?

Quer. 6. Could a ſociety of ſuch Individuals exiſt by Inſtitutions?

Quer. 7. Would not faction be the *only* recommendation to the notice of the public; if theſe fictitious principles be the *only* foundation of true reaſoning about the origin and extent of civil government?

Quer.

Quer. 8. If there be more ſpecies of wars than thoſe made to ſupport Tyranny and Liberty; do the preſent feuds differ from thoſe in the time of *Charles* the Firſt only in number of inſurgents?

Quer. 9. Has he not attempted to juſtify the Americans?

Quer. 10. Is the Delivery of temporizing diſcourſes conſiſtent with the duty of a Clergyman?

Quer. 11. Is the Offence not augmented by the Troubles of the State, the Learning of the Deliverer, and the Errors of the Doctrine?

Quer. 12. Whether the Publication of ſuch a Diſcourſe be not an aggravation of the offence; the plea of MISREPRESENTATION, an inſult to the diſcernment of the Univerſity, and the nomination of it a Sermon, a violation of Propriety?

Quer. 13. Will the Profeſſor's diſcourſe and patronage be forgotten in *three* Years?

tereſted expectation operate, where reaſon and argument had no effect: — it is poſſible, that under theſe circumſtances, the ſtrength of the conſtitution may be rapidly confirmed, and the fabric of modern licentiouſneſs and oppoſition finally ſubverted; — that the Bulk of the people will be convinced of the real ſources of their misfortunes, rouſe from their Lethargy, before a general oblivion be caſt over their ſouls, bid their public Ædifices ceaſe to ring with the impious horrors of diſaffection, and emulous of the virtues of their Anceſtors, with united efforts drag to condign puniſhment the moſt peſtilent of all Traytors, the *pious* Traytors of the conſtitution.

The Author's cautious method of writing will juſtify the Queriſt.

Quer. 1. Whether *Hobbes* or the *Apoſtle* could have afforded a paſſage, the better ſuited to this diſcourſe?

Quer. 2. Whether Dr. *Sandy's* text be a juſt repreſentation of our PROFESSOR's principles?

Quer. 3. Whether his ignorance of Liberty will be a ſufficient plea for confounding it with Independency?

Quer. 4. Whether his *proofs*, that the ſpecific Idea exiſts in every Individual, be not tedious and ſuperfluous: and has he proved any more?

Quer. 5. Whether the mutual univerſal malignity of our ſpecies be not a doctrine both ſhocking and erroneous?

Quer. 6. Could a ſociety of ſuch Individuals exiſt by Inſtitutions?

Quer. 7. Would not faction be the *only* recommendation to the notice of the public; if theſe fictitious principles be the *only* foundation of true reaſoning about the origin and extent of civil government?

Quer.

Quer. 8. If there be more ſpecies of wars than thoſe made to ſupport Tyranny and Liberty; do the preſent feuds differ from thoſe in the time of *Charles* the Firſt only in number of inſurgents?

Quer. 9. Has he not attempted to juſtify the Americans?

Quer. 10. Is the Delivery of temporizing diſcourſes conſiſtent with the duty of a Clergyman?

Quer. 11. Is the Offence not augmented by the Troubles of the State, the Learning of the Deliverer, and the Errors of the Doctrine?

Quer. 12. Whether the Publication of ſuch a Diſcourſe be not an aggravation of the offence; the plea of MISREPRESENTATION, an inſult to the diſcernment of the Univerſity, and the nomination of it a Sermon, a violation of Propriety?

Quer. 13. Will the Profeſſor's diſcourſe and patronage be forgotten in *three* Years?